

**MINUTES OF THE
SENATE COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES**

**Seventy-fourth Session
April 11, 2007**

The Senate Committee on Natural Resources was called to order by Chair Dean A. Rhoads at 3:30 p.m. on Wednesday, April 11, 2007, in Room 2144 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, Room 4412E, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. [Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda. [Exhibit B](#) is the Attendance Roster. All exhibits are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Senator Dean A. Rhoads, Chair
Senator Mike McGinness, Vice Chair
Senator Mark E. Amodei
Senator Joseph J. Heck
Senator Bob Coffin
Senator Michael A. Schneider
Senator Maggie Carlton

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Senator Dina Titus, Clark County Senatorial District No. 7

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Ardyss Johns, Committee Secretary
Matthew Pritchard, Intern to Senator Carlton
Susan Scholley, Committee Policy Analyst
Randy Stephenson, Committee Counsel
Christopher Trent, Intern to Senator Rhoads
Shirley Parks, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

David K. Schumann, Nevada Committee for Full Statehood
Janine Hansen, Nevada Eagle Forum
John P. Sande III, Western States Petroleum

Senate Committee on Natural Resources
April 11, 2007
Page 2

George Ross, Las Vegas Chamber of Commerce; Retail Association of Nevada
Rick Gimlin, Acting Director, State Department of Agriculture
Kyle Davis, Nevada Conservation League
Leo Drozdoff, P.E., Administrator, Division of Environmental Protection, State
Department of Conservation and Natural Resources
Ellen Allman, Caithness Energy
Joseph (Joe) Johnson, Toiyabe Chapter Sierra Club
Judy Stokey, Nevada Power Company; Sierra Pacific Power Company
Starla Lacy, Sierra Pacific Power Company
Rose E. McKinney-James, Barrick Gold of North America
Fred Schmidt, Ormat Nevada, Incorporated
Terry K. Graves, Nevada Electric Coalition
Charles Benjamin, Western Resource Advocates
Mike Elges, Chief, Bureau of Air Pollution Control, Division of Environmental
Protection, State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources
Jeff van Ee, Nevada Outdoor Recreation Association
Dan Geary, National Environmental Trust
Tracy Taylor, P.E., State Engineer, Division of Water Resources, State
Department of Conservation and Natural Resources
Gordon DePaoli, Truckee River Meadows Water Authority; Walker River
Irrigation District
Steve King, City of Fallon
Fred Messmann, Deputy Chief Game Warden, Department of Wildlife
Andy Belanger, Las Vegas Valley Water District; Southern Nevada Water
Authority

CHAIR RHOADS:

There are three bills to consider today and then we will proceed to the work session. The first bill is Senate Bill (S.B.) 295 presented by Senator Schneider.

SENATE BILL 295: Provides for the regulation of the price of gasoline and diesel fuel. (BDR 51-1170)

SENATOR MICHAEL A. SCHNEIDER (Clark County Senatorial District No. 11):
Senate Bill 295 is a bill that I feel is worded improperly. I would propose an amendment (Exhibit C) that would read, "Change from cap on wholesale gas price to a cap on the amount retailers are permitted to charge." Regulating the retail price of gas by the national average of all states west of the

Mississippi River would result in blended rates on the price of gas. Wholesale gas prices hold at about the same rate. I think the price on gas is being manipulated from state to state. Another change to S.B. 295 that I have endorsed is, "Transfer the State Agricultural Board enforcement to Highway Department Inspectors Pump Repairs and Inspection with power to cite violations" and "Place the money from fines to the Highway Fund versus the General Fund." I now will invite Senator Carlton's Intern, Matthew Pritchard, to present some of the research on this issue.

MATTHEW PRITCHARD (Intern to Senator Carlton):

I have had the dual pleasure this session of both interning for Senator Carlton and also working with Senator Schneider on this issue. I have been asked to present some of the research on the gasoline cap enacted in Hawaii in 2004, comparing it to S.B. 295 as it is to be amended. Briefly, I will explain the Hawaii bill with its main provisions and then address some of the problems that were experienced with the cap as it was implemented in that state. The Hawaii bill basically made it the first and only state to enact a gas cap. Act 77 originally was passed in 2002 to include a cap on both wholesale and retail gas prices. It was suspended until 2004, in order to allow the Hawaii Department of Business Development and Tourism to further study the feasibility of the cap. The final Act was passed by the legislature in 2005, with an amendment to remove the cap on retail prices, but leave the wholesale price cap in place. The prescribed method for determining the weekly cap on wholesale prices was to take the average wholesale price of gas in three areas on the mainland, namely, Los Angeles, the Gulf Coast and New York Harbor, and set the Hawaii price at that rate. The cap system first took effect in September 2005, and was discontinued only eight months later in May 2006, after it was generally thought that the state's capping scheme was ineffective and counterproductive.

Widely cited as one of the reasons for the perceived failure of Hawaii's experiment, was the particular method of regulating gas prices employed by the state. Wholesalers responded to the price cap imposed on them by charging the maximum amount allowable under the law each week irrespective of the actual market price. Because retailers were left free to add as high a markup as they wished, nothing prevented them from charging as much as they forecasted the market could bear. As a result of the capping of wholesale prices to the exclusion of the ultimate retail prices charged by the individual gas stations, the Hawaii price-capping scheme was most likely unsuccessful at saving consumers money.

Based on the foregoing information, it could be expected that a regulation capping only wholesale gas prices in Nevada would result in the State and its consumers encountering similar problems, and that a legal cap on the amount that can be charged by individual gas retailers would be a more effective means of lowering gas prices in Nevada.

SENATOR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you, Matthew, for your research. We point this out to show Hawaii went about this improperly and they allowed the wholesalers to manipulate the market. It is very similar to what happened, I believe, to electric deregulation in California. Hawaii is an easy market to manipulate because it is an island and everything is brought into them. The second item here is if our prices reflected the average of all states west of the Mississippi we would pay \$2.78 a gallon today for unleaded regular gas. The average in Nevada is currently \$3.02 a gallon. I will point out that the gas prices are about 20 cents higher in northern Nevada than in southern Nevada. The prices are varied from one end of the State to the other. I can remember the gas wars of the 1970s. The gas prices were erratic and falling to 18.9 cents a gallon. Obviously, we will not see these low prices again, and we no longer have the gas wars. I believe this is because of consolidation of the market and how the market is being manipulated. Oil companies often announce there is a shortage. Whenever I hear of a shortage, it reminds me of the 1970s and the gas lines at the pump. Now, we do not have a shortage. We can buy all the gas we want as long as we keep paying the price. I do not believe there is a shortage. Look at the big oil company profits from the last four years. Chevron Corporation's operating profit before depreciation, for example, has jumped from \$16.8 billion to \$34.8 billion in 4 years. Conoco Phillips Corporation has gone from \$12.2 billion to \$33 billion in 4 years. Exxon Mobile profits have jumped from \$32.2 billion to \$68.3 billion in 4 years. This, to me, does not indicate a shortage. It seems the more gas they sell the more money they are making. Gas companies are making record profits.

Senate Bill 295 is not a heavy-handed blow to the gas companies. This proposal would only be an average of all the states west of the Mississippi River. They need to sell to us at the average prices of gas in such cities as Omaha, Nebraska; Denver, Colorado; Phoenix, Arizona or Oklahoma City, Oklahoma. The results would be blended average rates. Our prices could drop at least 25 cents a gallon at the pump. Gas companies have been manipulating Nevada's gas

prices, mainly because Nevada has a huge tourist industry and we have island cities.

CHAIR RHOADS:

Would this be set on a weekly basis?

SENATOR SCHNEIDER:

Yes Mr. Chair. Yesterday, the U.S. House Domestic Policy Subcommittee sent a letter to major oil refineries requesting their plans to remedy the disparity of the California pump prices which are running about 50 cents a gallon above the U. S. average. The West Coast is being manipulated. Congress is finally getting involved with this issue. They have sent a letter of inquiry to the oil companies. They are only looking at California's gas prices. A comment made by one congressman was, Congress can no longer sit on the sidelines as escalating prices take a heavy economic toll on consumers and risk further harm to our economy. We have been neglected for the last decade and a half on this issue. Senate Bill 295 is our attempt at bringing stability back to prices at the retail level. Wholesalers will not manipulate the prices enough to drive the retailers out of business. There are others who are going to discuss the fact that gas is a commodity and is affected by the fluctuations of the market place. I have a short tape presentation titled, "The Brownfield Livestock Report" by Jerry Passer, from the *American AG Network*, dated February 14, 2007, at 6:04 a.m. to illustrate how the commodity market works ([Exhibit D](#)).

CHAIR RHOADS:

Are there any questions for Senator Schneider?

SENATOR COFFIN:

I know someone will bring this up, but I have always been leery of price controls. I know you do not like it either. Someone help me on my history. Is it true, the reason we did not have fuel supplies in the 1970s was because President Nixon instituted price controls as did President Carter during the oil crisis of the 1970s? How do we avoid making the same mistake they did? We lost availability of fuel, I believe.

SENATOR SCHNEIDER:

Yes, you may be right, however, this is totally different from what we are proposing. We are not saying they cannot charge more for gas. We are saying they cannot gouge us with gas prices.

SENATOR COFFIN:

It certainly is reasonable to be suspicious. There have not been any antitrust problems in Washington, D.C., for some time. I am wary of this sort of thing.

SENATOR SCHNEIDER:

I am wary also, but if the gas companies can make money in Omaha, Nebraska; Denver, Colorado; Phoenix, Arizona and other places like these, then they can also make money here.

CHAIR RHOADS:

Are there any other questions on this issue?

SENATOR SCHNEIDER:

I have the tape ready and would like to play a little of it.

CHAIR RHOADS:

Please do.

SENATOR SCHNEIDER:

It is my opinion we are being manipulated. There is gas underground at the service stations and the refineries are producing and we can still buy crude oil. We do not have pricing averages such as with other commodities. These are just indicators to me that something is not right with the market. We need to look at the issue especially the instant rises at the pump. Prices on groceries and other consumer goods are all affected by the price of oil. It is driving our whole economy.

DAVID SCHUMANN (Nevada Committee for Full Statehood):

I am with the Nevada Committee for Full Statehood. I am a former futures trader on the Chicago Board of Trade and a palm oil trader around the world. I have traded palm oil in London, England. I agree that petroleum is a commodity. All professional traders would also agree. A gallon of oil is interchangeable to another gallon of oil regardless of its origin. We pay the price to lug the oil from California to Nevada. Nevada has no refineries. We need to speak with various environmentalists as to how Nevada could gain permission to open new sources of oil through exploration. It is a supply-and-demand industry. The states that have lower prices drill for oil and also refine it. Please do not vote for this bill. A gas cap will only lead to more problems.

JANINE HANSEN (Nevada Eagle Forum):

I am state president for Nevada Eagle Forum. I sympathize with Senator Schneider's concern. The cost of simply traveling back and forth to work cost my husband nearly \$500 last month. The price of gas has a tremendous impact on our working families, not only in Nevada, but everywhere. I understand there is a very large pool of oil near Wells. This oil resource could make a huge difference in our cost of gas. This is an opportunity to respond to the concerns of Senator Schneider. There is another issue with the lack of free enterprise in the oil market. The corporations are cooperating with each other and the consumer is not protected. Inflation plays a large part with the cost of oil as well. We encourage the exploration of oil within Nevada.

SENATOR SCHNEIDER:

Janine Hansen and I do not always see issues the same way. However, when I go to the gas station and fill my tank, my constituents see me there and think I can do something about the gas price. One of the reports that came out yesterday from the Federal Trade Commission's court report in Washington, D.C., said the oil industry deliberately restricted refining capacity in California as population and demand grew to the point that even planned refinery maintenance causes a spike in price. This boosts profits. This is fine for the oil companies who no longer compete for price and can make more money without increasing sales. This is a manipulated market.

JOHN Sande III (Western States Petroleum):

I am here today on behalf of Western States Petroleum Association. I want to point out that Hawaii imposed gasoline caps beginning in September 2005, and suspended them on January 2006. This was after the Hawaiian Department of Business and Economic Development and Tourism estimated they had lost, during this period of time, for the consumer nearly \$55 million because of the price cap. A bipartisan study by Stillwater and Associates discovered the following conclusions. The price caps are not expected to have any significant benefit for Hawaii's gasoline consumers. Recent analysis suggests they would increase consumer costs. Price caps are likely to bring unwanted volatility and seasonality to the Hawaii market. A comprehensive examination of price-cap regulation implemented elsewhere failed to identify any examples where such schemes resulted in clear consumer benefit. A likely impact of price caps is that essential fuel services in rural areas would significantly decline and could potentially disappear. The price caps projected an antibusiness image of the state of Hawaii which created a detrimental investment climate in general and

specific investments in Hawaii's energy infrastructure in particular. Gasoline caps were tried in Hawaii and it was unsuccessful.

SENATOR SCHNEIDER:

I looked at John Sande's information. The report given by Intern, Matthew Pritchard reflected this. However, our bill says clearly that the retail price has to be the average gas price of the states west of the Mississippi River. Idaho, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Wyoming and the other western states' gasoline prices would be averaged taking the spike out of these prices. The lower prices consumers are paying in other states would be averaged into a blended rate for the Nevada consumer.

GEORGE ROSS (Las Vegas Chamber of Commerce; Retail Association of Nevada): I represent the Las Vegas Chamber of Commerce and the Retail Association of Nevada. Experience historically shows over and over again when price controls of any kind are put in place there is a distortion of the role for price as the way to ration between supply and demand and allow supply to match the demand the economy needs. This is how the economy is supposed to work. This bill leads to some real issues, and I have to react because I originally was prepared to testify on a bill that controlled wholesale prices. This one controls retail prices. If you take every state west of the Mississippi, there is only one pipeline between the mid-continent area and the West Coast that goes into Tucson, Arizona. All the West Coast supply and Nevada supply with the exception of the Northeast, comes from either California, Washington or is imported. The mid-continent supply comes from the vast refining complex in Louisiana, Texas and the surrounding states where there is a tremendous oil supply, oftentimes a surplus supply.

Because of the two differing situations, and because it costs a certain amount of money to bring a spot market tanker from Houston to the West Coast; it typically could have in a very long run, a cost difference between West Coast and mid-continent prices. Depending on the situation, this could be higher or lower. Taking the retail price which ultimately reflects this price and averaging in all the lower mid-continent prices, it could result in lower prices than the import areas. There is no way a wholesale company selling gasoline in Nevada or a retailer could afford to buy the gasoline because he would be selling at a loss.

The various state taxes are another issue that would have to be considered with these prices. There are big differences in state taxes, even regionally. There are differences in production costs for each state. Essentially, this could be a risk and a supply disruption. When there are situations where the prices may have been tightened up, all of a sudden this could lead to higher prices elsewhere. Potentially, it is impossible to find a supply to be purchased at a lower price.

SENATOR SCHNEIDER:

What has the industry done to prevent these price spikes? The lion's share of Nevada's gasoline comes from Alaska and the West Coast, but when there is a catastrophic event somewhere in the world, our gas prices immediately rise. Why is this?

MR. ROSS:

I do not intend to dodge the first question, but the oil companies will have to speak for themselves. I am here to represent the Las Vegas Chamber of Commerce and the Retail Association of Nevada. With regard to the second question, ultimately it is an integrated world market. The crude oil or product simply moves to maximize the price signals. Price continues to balance the market. It is responsive to the stock market and the futures market. Speculators take immediate advantage of any event that may cause an oil shortage problem on the chance that they could make a lot of money. When the event does not become a real problem, the oil prices come down again. I believe on Wall Street, if the investment experts thought the oil companies were making an extraordinary fortune and this was going to continue, then the stock price changes would reflect it.

SENATOR COFFIN:

Mr. Ross, you have been involved with some of these big companies and speak with a great deal of knowledge and experience. I believe the "bully pulpit" needs to come from Washington, D.C. No one has the desire to take on the oil companies, and it is not likely to happen. I am concerned for the country because of the oil and oil products' wholesale and retail prices, and how this is affecting our economy. It could have an end result of a backlash, a big mistake that could not be corrected.

CHAIR RHOADS:

Is there anyone in Las Vegas who wants to testify? If not, we will close the hearing on S.B. 295 and open the hearing on S.B. 486.

SENATE BILL 486: Makes various changes concerning the ownership of brands for livestock. (BDR 50-622)

RICK GIMLIN (Acting Director, State Department of Agriculture):

Senate Bill 486 is requested to address the second audit recommendation of the Legislative Counsel Bureau audit, LAO6-12 conducted last year ([Exhibit E](#), original is on file in the Research Library). The audit recommended the Division of Livestock Identification charge brand transfer fees according to *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 564.025 and 564.080. Senate Bill 486 will align agency policy and state statutes and allow the Division to amend a brand without charging a transfer fee for the following: submission of legal proof of name change such as adoption, removal of name of parent or guardian upon the owner of the brand reaching eighteen, a woman who is sole owner changing her last name, due to marriage, death of a brand holder and the inclusion of a brand in a living will or trust.

CHAIR RHOADS:

Is this the result of an audit?

MR. GIMLIN:

It is. The department was following a policy that was not consistent with statute. This is a long-standing policy for the Division; from my understanding, ten years or better. This is a request by the industry that these types of changes in brands not be charged a fee. They are relatively infrequent. There is no particular fiscal impact.

CHAIR RHOADS:

We will close the hearing on S.B. 486 and open the hearing on S. B. 422

SENATE BILL 422: Requires the State Environmental Commission to establish a program for the reduction of greenhouse gases emitted by affected units in this State. (BDR 40-678)

SENATOR DINA TITUS (Clark County Senatorial District No. 7):

An overwhelming body of scientific evidence paints a clear picture: climate change is happening, it is caused in large part by human activity, and it will have many serious and potentially damaging effects in the decades ahead. Scientists have confirmed the earth is warming, and greenhouse-gas emissions from cars, power plants and other manmade sources—rather than the natural

variations in climate—are the primary cause. According to a recent report issued by the Pew Research Center, a nonprofit, nonpartisan organization dedicated to advancing debate through credible analysis and cooperative approaches, scientists predict that if the increase in greenhouse-gas emissions continues unabated, temperatures will rise by as much as ten degrees Fahrenheit by the end of this century, causing dramatic and irreversible changes to the climate. The consequences, both anticipated and unforeseen, will have profound ramifications for humanity and the world as a whole. Water supplies in some critical areas will dwindle as snow and ice disappear. Sea levels will rise, threatening coastal populations. Droughts and floods will become more common. Hurricanes and other powerful storms will increase in intensity. Adding to the threat will be the impacts of climate change on agricultural production and the spread of disease. Human health will be jeopardized by all these changes.

Climate change is not just a daunting challenge; it is also an enormous opportunity for innovation. While there is no “silver bullet” technological solution, many tools already exist for addressing climate change, and new options on the horizon could potentially yield dramatic reductions in worldwide emissions of greenhouse gases. Key policy solutions include investments in science and technology research; efficiency standards for buildings, vehicles, and appliances; and perhaps most importantly, an overall limit on greenhouse-gas emissions and a market for reductions.

Actions are being taken internationally, in Washington, D.C., and in states and communities across the country. And at every level, businesses are exhibiting a new willingness to help shape solutions as indicated in public opinion findings ([Exhibit F](#)). Nationally, a number of greenhouse-gas bills are currently being considered. They are sponsored by Democrats and Republicans; U.S. Senators McCain, Lieberman, Bingaman, Domenici, Feinstein, Carper, Sanders and others have introduced a variety of so-called “cap and trade” bills which set mandatory caps on greenhouse-gas emissions and establish an allowable trading program whereby businesses can buy and sell emission credits from other companies that have exceeded their reduction targets. These bills are being supported by large power companies including Pacific Gas and Electric.

SENATOR TITUS:

Many states and regions have moved ahead of Congress and are taking action on their own. States are setting targets for reducing their greenhouse-gas

emissions, adopting policies to promote renewable energy and energy efficiency, and developing statewide climate action plans. At the regional level, states are coming together to launch emissions trading programs and support clean energy development. While confronting the challenge of climate change requires a national and international response, the states and regions have a valuable role to play in showing what works and in laying the groundwork for broader action. By taking action to address climate change, states are fulfilling their role in American democracy as "policy laboratories," developing initiatives that serve as models for federal action. In working to address climate change, many states have reached beyond their borders to enlist neighboring states in collaborative efforts. These regional initiatives can be more efficient than actions taken by individual states. Regional efforts cover a broader geographic area and in turn, more sources of greenhouse-gas emissions. They eliminate duplication of work among the states, and they help businesses by bringing greater uniformity and predictability to state rules and regulations.

Existing regional arrangements include:

1. The Northeast Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative
2. Western Governors' Association's Clean and Diversified Energy Initiative
3. Southwest Climate Change Initiative
4. West Coast Governors' Global Warming Initiative
5. New England Governors' and Eastern Canadian Premiers' Climate Action Plan
6. Powering the Plains

The bill as originally written would have mirrored U.S. Senator Feinstein's bill and established a cap and trade system in Nevada aimed at reducing our greenhouse-gas emissions. After further study and extensive discussion with Division of Environmental Protection (DEP), utility representatives and environmental groups, I have concluded that Nevada is not ready for a full-blown cap and trade program. We cannot afford to sit on our hands and do nothing. We must begin the process so we can do our part to address global warming and also be competitive in the western credits market as soon as possible. Accordingly, I bring you a consensus amendment that starts the ball rolling ([Exhibit G](#)). In S.B. 422 section 5, the Division of Environmental Protection shall develop a statewide greenhouse-gas inventory which will evaluate the sources, types and amounts of greenhouse gases released in the State. Greenhouse gases are defined in section 3 as carbon dioxide, hydrofluorocarbons, methane, nitrous oxide, perfluorocarbons, and sulphur hexafluoride. In section 6, by 2008, the State Environmental Commission shall

establish requirements for participation in a verifiable greenhouse-gas registry and mandate reporting of all greenhouse gases emitted from each affected unit, beginning with power generators, on an annual basis.

This inventory and registry will provide information about the sources, types and amount of greenhouse-gas emissions in Nevada. We can then use this information to set reasonable caps and reduction timetables and to create an emission credit trade program so Nevada companies can buy and sell credits within the State and throughout the west.

KYLE DAVIS (Nevada Conservation League):

I am the policy director for the Nevada Conservation League. Today, we come forward to express our strong support for S.B. 422 as amended. Senator Titus has laid out the issue very well. Essentially, what we are looking at is the clear consensus that global warming is a problem we need to talk about it, we need to deal with and lay the ground work for climate change here in Nevada and throughout the United States. Recent polling tells us two-thirds of Nevada citizens feel the same way. We think this bill as amended is a great first step to figuring out how we are doing as a state with greenhouse-gas emissions. It makes good sense to find out what we are emitting and from what sources and where it is coming from. This way we can reduce the greenhouse-gas emissions and actually become a leader in the fight against global warming and become a leader in utilizing sources in clean energy.

LEO DROZDOFF, P.E. (Administrator, Division of Environmental Protection, State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources):

It is a pleasure to appear before you today in support of S.B. 422 as amended. I will keep my remarks brief. The DEP believes the creation of a detailed inventory to identify quantified issues to be addressed is a critical first step to develop any environmental program. We also support the establishment of a registry that can be used to document any progress made by the utility industry in reducing greenhouse-gas emissions. Not only can such a registry be useful to the power industry, but any other entity that wishes to do so, may be able to document their achievements. This amendment significantly reduces the fiscal impact on our agency. We are now expecting that only one position will be required to implement provisions of S.B. 422. At the direction of the Governor's Office, we propose to fund this position during the initial two-year period with revenues from DEP's recent settlement with Nevada Power Company. Because of the recommendation made by the Governor's Nevada Climate Change

Advisory Committee may affect future resource needs, further support for this overall effort will be evaluated and included in the next biennial budget. It is my understanding any regulatory recommendations from this committee will come to the State Environmental Commission for consideration.

CHRISTOPHER TRENT (Intern to Senator Rhoads):

I have studied political integration and issues such as Europe's efforts to deal with global climate change. Before I start, I will make a disclaimer for the record. I am currently an intern in Chair Rhoad's office and although he has been privy to all information and opinions I will share today, my testimony is on my behalf only. In light of the amendment proposed by Senator Titus, my position on S.B. 422 is ambivalent. As Senator Titus has mentioned, there is a broad consensus in the scientific community about the existence of anthropogenic or man-made climate change. The debate going on now questions how serious the consequences will be and in what manner the threat will come. This is a multigenerational issue. I can say with confidence there is no one in this room, myself included, who will live to see the final chapter of this debate. The Nevada Legislature will be asked to offer its opinions on and solutions to anthropogenic climate change. I want to be clear that S.B. 422, neither before or after this amendment, is not going to fix climate change. No single piece of legislation, no treaty or no directive will solve the problem. The sum of such efforts, however, just may. Along with legislators and politicians around the world, this Legislature will share the burden ([Exhibit H](#)). Prior to the amendment as the Senator has mentioned, S.B. 422 would create a so called cap-and-trade scheme in Nevada. This cap-and-trade scheme is loosely modeled on the Kyoto Protocol, signed in 1999, and included Article 6 at the insistence of the United States which allowed states to exchange credits for the reduction of greenhouse-gas emissions. The goal was simply to create a market where polluters' profits could be invested in emission reduction for countries, who would otherwise not be able to afford such programs. Rather than limit the output from polluters in rich countries, they could meet their requirements by spending money to help other countries surpass their requirements.

In 2005, the European Union created the first so-called "carbon" market. So far, trading is very robust on this market. In the previous form, S.B. 422 did give me some reservations on cost and potential effectiveness. Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger of California has attempted to do much the same thing and has realized recently it would be excessively expensive ([Exhibit I](#)). He is now trying to get California integrated into the European

mission's trading scheme. My question under the previous language of the bill would be simply, why would Nevada not do something similar. I do not see any reason to reinvent the wheel. After the last reservations, I would have wholeheartedly supported the bill.

Under the amendment, as I understand it, the bill would not create any kind of cap-and-trade scheme. In fact, it would use a chunk of money to essentially watch smokestacks in Nevada. I do not think this is a dismissible project. However, I would suggest if the committee is interested in knowing how much greenhouse gas Nevada's power plants are emitting, they would be better served by an interim study rather than statute. Moreover, the amended S.B. 422 would not entice Nevada power plants to invest in emissions reduction programs elsewhere. More importantly neither would it entice the rest of the world to invest in Nevada's development of clean energy. I would suggest to the Committee that this should be a primary goal. Therefore, I do not support the amended S.B. 422. I would encourage the committee not to turn a blind eye on other efforts to create such a cap-and-trade scheme in Nevada. In my view Mr. Chair, it is in all of our interests to ensure that Nevada enjoy a position of leadership on the issue.

ELLEN ALLMAN (Caithness Energy):

Caithness Energy owns and operates two geothermal plants in northern Nevada and a gas plant in Las Vegas. I want to thank Senator Titus for her efforts in bringing forth the amended proposed legislation. We support the amended version of S.B. 422 and like the idea of a registry and the inventory of the greenhouse gases being emitted in Nevada. As I understand it, this includes all different industries, not just power plants.

JOSEPH (JOE) JOHNSON (Toiyabe Chapter Sierra Club):

The Toiyabe Chapter of the Sierra Club is going on record as supporting the amended version of S.B. 422 and wants to compliment the Senator for bringing forth the bill.

JUDY STOKEY (Nevada Power Company; Sierra Pacific Power Company):

Nevada Power Company and Sierra Pacific Power Company are here in support of the amendment to S.B. 422. We worked with Senator Titus and appreciate that she was so willing to discuss these issues with us. Today I have with me, our director of environmental services, Starla Lacy, who would like to make a brief statement.

STARLA LACY (Sierra Pacific Power Company):

Speaking as the utility which will be the first sector to be affected by participation in the registry, I want to let the committee know I underscore the comments by Leo Drozdoff and others of support for this bill. As a company, we certainly believe an inventory is an important first step to address the climate-change issue. We are pleased to participate in this initiative.

ROSE MCKINNEY-JAMES (Barrick Gold of North America):

Barrick Gold is here to offer support for this bill as amended. Many of you know Barrick Gold recently became engaged with generating electricity. In addition, we have a request for proposal for a solar plant. These actions are very positive, and we believe this bill represents a very important first step toward engaging the state in continuing debate. We thank Senator Titus for this measure.

FRED SCHMIDT (Ormat Nevada, Incorporated):

I am here on behalf of Ormat Nevada. Ormat is the largest geothermal power producer in Nevada owning nine geothermal plants. Ormat is pleased to join in supporting the amendment offered here today.

TERRY GRAVES (Nevada Electric Coalition):

I represent Nevada Electric Coalition which has three coal generation units located in southern Nevada. We are neutral today. My clients are reviewing the amendment.

CHARLES BENJAMIN (Western Resource Advocates):

I am the lead attorney and director of Western Resource Advocates. We are a conservation organization. We have an interest in water, land and energy issues in the intermountain west. I want to speak in favor of this bill for a reason Senator Titus may not have considered, because she could not have anticipated it when she drafted the amended version. It is the recent U.S. Supreme Court decision in the *Massachusetts et al. v. Environmental Protection Agency et al.* The U.S. Supreme Court has now determined global greenhouse-gas emissions, carbon dioxide and other emissions that are identified in the bill are now pollutants under the Federal Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Clean Air Act as amended in 1990. This means the EPA will be developing some sort of regulatory regime for greenhouse-gas emissions. Under the structure of the Clean Air Act, the states play some role in administering all federal antipollution laws. It is good for Nevada to have an idea, just from the data perspective, of what is out there in terms of greenhouse-gas emissions. It is possible the federal

government will try to do some sort of registry, as well. It is best for each state to have its own database. I urge the passing of this amended version of the bill.

SENATOR HECK:

I have a question for Senator Titus. What is the reason for the reduction in the size of the number of megawatts? In the original bill, it was 25 megawatts in an affected unit, and in the amendment it is at 5 megawatts.

MIKE ELGES (Chief, Bureau of Air Pollution Control, Division of Environmental Protection, State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources):

While assisting with the development of this language, from the studies we looked at, one of the criteria was the threshold for megawatt capacity. We did a fairly lengthy review to determine what a reasonable cut point would be. The 25 megawatts seemed large for the scope of our focus in distinguishing the difference between what would be utilized in the form of the registry versus that of the inventory. We did some jostling to bring the value down so that larger units offering generated power for sale on the grid would be captured in the unit definition to ensure that they would be part of the registry down to this megawatt level. Again let me underscore, it will not prohibit anybody from using the registry, but we wanted to make sure there was a mandatory down to that level.

JEFF VAN EE (Nevada Outdoor Recreation Association):

I am the associate director of the Nevada Outdoor Recreation Association. I have been active in a number of environmental issues in Nevada since the early 1970s. I have been a research scientist with the EPA for 34 years. I want to commend Senator Titus for introducing the legislation and for the amendment. I think it is an important first step. I have several concerns. One concern as this debate develops over global climate change, and meaningful steps are taken, increasingly the states and federal government will look to the emissions that we were producing in the 1990s. As I understand the amendment, basically the inventory process begins with the year 2008. We would be well served after we allow the State Environmental Commission to work out the details of how to measure carbon dioxide emissions and how we develop the database. Then we can look back and try to estimate what those emissions were as far back as 1990. The other point of my concern is the comprehensiveness of the inventory. To be most meaningful in reducing greenhouse emissions, we need to look at all the sources of emissions including the motor vehicle as well. I hope the Legislature is looking at other measures

that can be effective at reducing greenhouse gases such as efficiency measures. This is certainly part of the package.

DAN GEARY (National Environmental Trust):

I am the Nevada spokesperson for the National Environmental Trust. A decade ago I appeared before this committee to oppose a joint resolution. The resolution was essentially opposing participation in the Kyoto protocol. We have come a long way since my presentation on global warming as a real phenomenon, and man-made pollutants are a factor has met with more than a little skepticism. Since the early 1990s, our understanding as scientists and the consensus among scientists has certainly come a long way. We want to be on record supporting S.B. 422.

This is a very important first step. There is, whether it is a state, regional or national policy, in the near future we will be under a new regulatory regime. Greenhouse-gas emissions will have to be reduced, not merely pursuing voluntary measures we hope will slow the increase, because science tells us this is a path for disaster. We want to thank and commend Senator Titus for her leadership on this issue. We have come a long way. It is certainly to benefit everyone in Nevada that our state and our regulatory structure are as capable as possible to capitalize on this new energy economy and a new energy infrastructure.

SENATOR TITUS:

I would like to answer a question with a reference to something Mr. van Ee said. In 2008, the inventory will be completed but as part of the inventory process there will be a review of previous emissions. This will address his concern.

CHAIR RHOADS:

We will close the hearing on S.B. 422 and open the hearing on S.B. 105.

SENATE BILL 105: Revises provisions governing regulation of motor vehicle fuel. (BDR 51-258)

Ms. SCHOLLEY:

The bill requires the State Board of Agriculture to adopt ASTM International, formerly the American Society for Testing Materials, standards for gas vapor pressure.

SENATOR CARLTON MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED
S.B. 105.

SENATOR AMODEI SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR RHOADS:

We will now open the hearing on S.B. 272.

SENATE BILL 272: Revises provisions governing awarding of costs and attorney's fees in certain actions involving rights to graze or water livestock. (BDR 50-370)

CHAIR RHOADS:

Senate Bill 272 revises government rewarding of costs and attorney fees in certain actions involving rights to graze or water livestock.

Ms. SCHOLLEY:

This bill mandates an award of attorney fees and costs to the winning party in litigation by a person contesting the rights of another to graze or water livestock on public lands. Based on testimony at the hearing, the sponsor, Senator Rhoads, proposes an amendment which would limit the mandatory award of attorney fees to the defendant of the case.

SENATOR AMODEI MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED
S.B. 272.

SENATOR MCGINNESS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (SENATOR CARLTON VOTED NO.)

* * * * *

CHAIR RHOADS:

We will now open the hearing on S.B. 274.

SENATE BILL 274: Makes various changes to provisions governing the State Engineer. (BDR 48-206)

MS. SCHOLLEY:

This bill authorizes the state water engineer to impose administrative fines and seek injunctive relief for violations of water law. The amendment proposed to the bill is by Gordon DePaoli representing Truckee Meadows Water Authority and the Walker River Irrigation District ([Exhibit J](#)). It would add language to S.B. 274. There are some concerns as the need of this addition. Others feel they are neutral on the amendment being included. One variation on the theme would be to adopt this language but strike the end, "regulations promulgated thereunder."

TRACY TAYLOR, P.E., (State Engineer, Division of Water Resources, State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources):
We agree with the language and have no problem with it.

SENATOR MCGINNESS:

Mr. Taylor, why would you approve something that would restrict you from enacting the state water law?

MR. TAYLOR:

I do not believe this restricts me enforcing state water law. I do not think I can trump a federal decree that is administered by the court.

SENATOR MCGINNESS:

I still have some concerns but I feel better with the language revision by Ms. Scholley, omitting, "regulations promulgated thereunder."

GORDON DEPAOLI (Truckee Meadows River Water Authority; Walker River Irrigation District):

I have a suggestion to help with this. In lieu of the omitted three words, "regulations promulgated thereunder," consider substituting these words, "an agreement thereunder to which the State of Nevada is a party", [Exhibit J](#). I suggest this because my concern relates specifically to certain provisions of the Truckee River Operating Agreement which will not happen unless Nevada is in fact a party. Under the act that authorizes, it is a federal regulation.

STEVE KING (City of Fallon):

I appreciate Mr. DePaoli's proposed substitute language. It is a step in the right direction. There still should be some caution, as the language would appear to enforce Nevada water rights and water law that would say, "Oh, by the way,

certain water rights would be subject to court decree." It seems like a matter of policy when something is written in the statute, it might be a seed planted with future implications that might take on other meaning. With this in mind, I think the substitute language is a great improvement.

SENATOR MCGINNESS:

As a matter of legislative record, this is not intended to be a seed.

SENATOR AMODEI MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED
S.B. 274 WITH THE SUBSTITUTE LANGUAGE OF MESSRS. DEPOALI,
KING, AND TAYLOR.

SENATOR CARLTON SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR RHOADS:

We will open the work session on S.B. 275.

SENATE BILL 275: Makes various changes relating to underground water.
(BDR 48-208)

Ms. SCHOLLEY:

This is the domestic well bill from the interim study. It will do five basic things as laid out in the bill. The bill mock-up incorporates all the comments that were received during the hearing and some additional two cleanup words proposed by the state engineer's office. This proposal is consistent with the interim study committee's original recommendations.

SENATOR AMODEI MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED
S.B. 275.

SENATOR MCGINNESS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

Senate Committee on Natural Resources
April 11, 2007
Page 22

CHAIR RHOADS:

WE WILL OPEN THE HEARING ON S.B. 276.

SENATE BILL 276: Makes various changes relating to water. (BDR 30-207)

MS. SCHOLLEY:

This bill was recommended by the interim study. It has two parts. First, the Water Rights Technical Support Fund that was created last session will expand the eligible uses of the fund. The A.B. No. 198 of the 66th Session established the Board for Financing Water Projects funding (A.B. 198 Program). Second, it amends the current so-called A.B. 198 Program in chapter 349 of the NRS to expand the eligible uses of the fund to include infrastructure development to implement such purposes. Most of the changes are cleanup language suggested in the interim study.

CHAIR RHOADS:

This bill has to be sent to the Senate Committee on Finance if it is approved.

SENATOR CARLTON:

I support the bill. I have a problem with the \$1 million in the Water Rights Technical Support Fund. I have had calls on this issue. This bill has not gone over as well with people as we originally thought. The intent was to give \$1 million to assist with development of information and planning. This issue will not need another \$1 million for another 2 years.

SENATOR AMODEI MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED
S.B. 276 USING AMENDMENTS 1 AND 3 PROPOSED BY THE DIVISION
OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION.

SENATOR MCGINNESS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (SENATORS COFFIN AND CARLTON VOTED
NO.)

* * * * *

CHAIR RHOADS:

We will open the hearing on S.B. 306.

SENATE BILL 306: Regulates the operation of a motorboat equipped with an engine cut-off switch. (BDR 43-81)

Ms. SCHOLLEY:

This bill regulates the operation of a motor boat equipped with an "engine cut-off switch." This bill defines "engine cut-off switch." After the original hearing, amendments were proposed. The amendments would limit the impact of this bill to motor boats less than 26 feet in length and that are operating above flat-wake speed. This would be approximately five miles an hour.

SENATOR HECK:

Is there an explanation of why the limit of a boat is less than 26 feet?

FRED MESSMANN (Deputy Chief Game Warden, Department of Wildlife):

After the hearing, we were contacted by a couple of our boating constituents and they asked that we not impose the limit on boats over 26 feet. Accident statistics bear this out. People do not fall overboard in much larger boats. The flat-wake issue concerns people coming into a dock that need to move away from a station to handle lines, trolling while fishing and could walk around the boat.

SENATOR HECK:

I still wonder why the limit of 26 feet? People fall off big boats too!

MR. MESSMANN:

This is a safety issue. They do. If it is your pleasure to omit the limit of less than 26 feet the department would have no opposition.

SENATOR HECK:

I would move to accept S.B. 306 but only the flat-wake issue.

SENATOR COFFIN:

The lanyard length on a larger boat could become quite a safety issue, as well. Someone could strangle themselves with the longer lengths.

MR. MESSMANN:

The big issue with safety on the larger boats is the high speed with a single operator. These boats are 30- to 36-foot boats.

Senate Committee on Natural Resources
April 11, 2007
Page 24

SENATOR COFFIN:

How is law enforcement going to handle these issues?

MR. MESSMANN:

As a patrol officer myself, I would say enforcement would come through accident investigation, though after the fact of a concrete violation. It would be more of an education issue about requirements while boating.

SENATOR COFFIN:

Is not this the point, the prevention of accidents?

MR. MESSMANN:

The emphasis for enforcement through the Department of Wildlife would be education. However, we do have authority for further enforcement.

SENATOR HECK MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED
S.B. 306.

SENATOR CARLTON SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR RHOADS:

We will open the work session on S.B. 376.

SENATE BILL 376: Requires the State Land Use Planning Agency to prepare a statewide master plan for the recreational use of land in this State.
(BDR 26-1009)

MS. SCHOLLEY:

Senate Bill 376 originally required the state land use planning agency to prepare a statewide master plan, containing a \$2.5 million appropriation. At the hearing, the sponsor proposed amendments; however, the sponsor asked for some time to work with interested parties and propose further amendments. The final product with new language added is S.B. 376.

SENATOR HECK MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED

S.B. 376.

SENATOR AMODEI SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (SENATORS COFFIN AND CARLTON VOTED NO.)

* * * * *

CHAIR RHOADS:

We will open the work session on S.B. 405.

SENATE BILL 405: Revises provisions governing the appropriation of public waters. (BDR 48-1158)

Ms. SCHOLLEY:

Senate Bill 405 proposes a number of clarifications to the authority in procedures in the state engineer's office. As you will recall, the original bill was extensively amended by a mock-up requested by Senator Amodei, the sponsor of the bill. At the direction of Senator Rhoads, the interested parties met on Friday, April 6, 2007. They discussed the mock-up and received general consensus as reflected in the attached revised mock-up. There was a split of opinion on section 1. Based on the amendments in the mock-up, the State engineer's office has indicated the fiscal note could be withdrawn.

SENATOR AMODEI:

This is the same language issue from the earlier bill a while back concerning federal decrees. Is this still an issue in the mock-up?

MR. DEPAOLI:

There was some language in the mock-up I had suggested earlier. I am comfortable with the omission of this issue in the mock-up. Another area, though is in section 3, it needs to be changed ([Exhibit K](#)).

SENATOR AMODEI:

The proposed additional amendment is fine with me.

SENATOR COFFIN:

Help me find the definition for consumptive use. I see references to the issue. You indicated to me the engineer would define it.

SENATOR AMODEI:

I am not wed to a particular definition but it needs to be put into the statute. The state engineer knows specifically where to find it and can describe the final agreement.

MR. TAYLOR:

Actually, there is no definition at this time of consumptive use, but I do have to consider consumptive use when looking at applications to change.

SENATOR COFFIN:

How can you consider something that is not defined?

MR. TAYLOR:

There are different ways to define consumptive use, depending on the different uses. Irrigation, for example, or mining or milling or wetlands, all of these and others could not be defined in a statute.

SENATOR COFFIN:

I was under the impression that we would have the definition. I like to listen to what people of the water authority in southern Nevada have to say about this. They thought a definition would be useful. This is based on what is done in the basins of the south, and so they, as may others in Nevada, see the issue differently. If Las Vegas signs off on this, I will have no problem with the bill. Has The Southern Nevada Water Authority seen this?

SENATOR AMODEI:

I appreciate Senator Coffin's concern. If you will look on page 2, even though we have not specifically defined consumptive use, I assume it will be fairly basic. We have put in statute by this proposed amendment, the state engineer may consider consumptive use, which is a step in the right direction. So, while we have not attempted to globally define it in the hundreds of basins and river systems in Nevada, we have said in the statute, that this is an area for consideration. We will leave it to the fact-finding process in the state engineer's proceedings.

Senate Committee on Natural Resources
April 11, 2007
Page 27

ANDY BELANGER (Las Vegas Valley Water District; Southern Nevada Water Authority):

The Southern Nevada Water Authority is fine with the language related to consumptive use. Our one comment would be to have an explicit statement that exempts tributaries of the Colorado River. They are not technically subject to a federal or state compact. We are accessing some pre-compact rights on the Muddy River and the Virgin River. Without this exemption, the water could flow to Arizona or California.

MR. TAYLOR:

I agree with Andy Belanger, this should be part of the amendment.

SENATOR AMODEI:

I will support this amendment.

SENATOR AMODEI MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED
S.B. 405.

SENATOR COFFIN SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR RHOADS:

We will go to the reading of S.B. 484.

SENATE BILL 484: Creates the position of Rural Land Use Planner within the Division of State Lands of the State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources. (BDR 26-397)

MS. SCHOLLEY:

This bill creates the position of rural land-use planner within the Division of State Lands. This was a recommendation of the public lands committee. At the hearing, Senator Rhoads proposed an amendment to S.B. 484 which in lieu of creating this position in chapter 321 of the NRS, would amend the bill to authorize this position in the Division of State Lands' budget and generally describe the duties of the position. It adds an appropriation which is the fiscal note of the bill. This would include a statement of intent that this would be considered as part of the base budget.

CHAIR RHOADS:

The small communities do not have the staff that the larger counties have for various services. The intent of S.B. 484 is to have someone in the Division of State Lands who could work out of the Carson City office, but provide a statewide representative to these local, rural areas. This bill, if passed, would go to the Committee on Senate Finance.

SENATOR MCGINNESS MOVED TO AMEND DO PASS AS AMENDED
S.B. 484.

SENATOR AMODEI SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR RHOADS:

We will open the work session on Senate Joint Resolution (S.J.R.) 10.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 10: Expresses support for the designation of trails for off-highway vehicles by certain federal agencies. (BDR R-1350)

Ms. SCHOLLEY:

This resolution relates to the designation of trails for off-highway vehicles by certain federal agencies. The only change Nevada Responsible Trails Alliance asked for was an addition of the "resolved" clause you see before you.

SENATOR AMODEI MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED
S.J.R. 10.

SENATOR MCGINNESS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR RHOADS:

We will open the work session on S.J.R. 11.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 11: Encourages certain activities relating to the use of biomass in the production of energy in Nevada. (BDR R-402)

Ms. SCHOLLEY:

This resolution is a public lands committee recommendation and relates to encouraging biomass activities in Nevada. There are no amendments at this time.

SENATOR AMODEI MOVED TO DO PASS S.J.R. 11.

SENATOR CARLTON SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR RHOADS:

We will open the work session on S.J.R. 12.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 12: Expresses disapproval of recent civil actions filed against local ranchers and the Bureau of Land Management in the management of public rangelands and the issuance of grazing permits for those public rangelands. (BDR R-396)

Ms. SCHOLLEY:

This is another recommendation of the public lands committee expressing disapproval of the litigation filed against ranchers and the Bureau of Land Management over the management of public rangeland and grazing allotments and permits. No amendments were proposed to this resolution.

SENATOR HECK MOVED TO DO PASS S.J.R. 12.

SENATOR MCGINNESS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (SENATOR CARLTON VOTED NO.)

* * * * *

Senate Committee on Natural Resources
April 11, 2007
Page 30

CHAIR RHOADS:

We will open the work session on S.J.R. 13.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 13: Urges Congress to provide additional appropriations for the prevention and suppression of wildfires and the rehabilitation of public rangelands in Nevada. (BDR R-468)

Ms SCHOLLEY:

This is a public lands committee recommendation urging Congress to provide additional funding for prevention and suppression of wildfires and for rehabilitation of public rangelands damaged by wildfires. No amendments were proposed.

SENATOR HECK MOVED TO DO PASS S.J.R. 13.

SENATOR CARLTON SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR RHOADS:

We will open the work session on S.J.R. 18

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 18: Urges Congress to support a proposed off-highway vehicle park in Clark County. (BDR R-1433)

Ms. SCHOLLEY:

This is a proposal by Senate Committee on Government Affairs urging Congress to allow conveyance of the Nellis Dunes area to Clark County for use as an off-road recreation area and for environmental protection purposes. No amendments were proposed at the hearing.

SENATOR SCHNEIDER MOVED TO DO PASS S.J.R. 18.

SENATOR HECK SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Senate Committee on Natural Resources
April 11, 2007
Page 31

* * * * *

CHAIR RHOADS:

There being no further business, we will adjourn the Senate Committee on Natural Resources at 6:03 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Shirley Parks,
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Senator Dean A. Rhoads, Chair

DATE: _____